

Initiative Definition

Initiative Definition

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Template Name | BY2020 |
| Is this investment a consolidated business case? | No |
| Consolidated Business Case Parent Investment(s) | |
| Investment Name | BFS - Budget Formulation System |
| Investment Revision Number | 33 |
| Point of Contact | Chin, Derek |
| Revision Comment | |
| Class | IT |

Administrative Information

Administrative Information

| | |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| Agency | Environmental Protection Agency |
| Bureau | Office Of The Chief Financial Officer |
| Name of this Investment | BFS - Budget Formulation System |
| Unique Investment Identifier 9 Digit Code | 000010070 |
| Full UPI/UII Code | 020-000010070 00-00-02-16-02-00 |
| OMB Investment Category | 00 |
| Part of Agency IT Portfolio Summary | IT Investments for Mission Delivery and Management Support |
| OMB Investment Type | 02 - Non-Major IT Investment |

OMB Major Mission Area

Multi-Goal IT Investments

Previous (UII) (12 digits required for all legacy investments)

020-000010070 00-00-01-01-02-00

Cost Tracking IT Code

Investment Overview

General Information

Key Project Dates

Project initiation date:

Planning, Acquisition, or Development completion date:

Scheduled retirement date:

How does the investment support EPA's Mission, Strategic Goals, Sub-Objectives, Program Activities and Objectives?

Identify any systems within or outside the Agency with which the investment has interdependencies. Describe the nature of the interdependency.

Who are the Customers, Stakeholders, and Collaborators, including Regions and other partners?

Contact information of Program/Project Manager?

Program/Project Manager Name

Program/Project Manager E-mail

Program/Project Manager Phone Number

Is the investment 508 compliant?

If yes, provide the date and describe how compliance was verified:

Does the investment have a complete and accurate record in READ?

Budget Information

Summary of Funding

Life Cycle Costs FOR PROJECT STAGES

* Costs in thousands

| | PY - 6 2012 and Prior | PY - 5 2013 | PY - 4 2014 | PY - 3 2015 | PY - 2 2016 | PY - 1 2017 | PY 2018 | CY 2019 | BY 2020 | BY + 1 2021 | BY + 2 2022 | BY + 3 2023 | BY + 4 2024 | BY + 5 2025 | BY + 6 2026 | BY + 7 2027 | BY + 8 2028 and Beyond | Total |
|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|-------|
| Planning Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 700 |
| Proposed Budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DME (Excluding Planning) Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 0 | 0 | 500 | 998 | 0 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2998 |
| Proposed Budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Planning Govt. FTE Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proposed Budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DME (Excluding Planning) Govt. FTE Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 0 | 0 | 95 | 267 | 278 | 284 | 283 | 283 | 77 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 0 | 1742 |
| Proposed Budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sub-Total DME Costs (Including Govt. FTE) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 0 | 0 | 595 | 1265 | 278 | 784 | 783 | 783 | 77 | 125 | 125 | 125 | 125 | 125 | 125 | 125 | 0 | 5440 |
| Proposed Budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| O&M Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1160 | 850 | 850 | 850 | 1160 | 1250 | 1250 | 1250 | 1250 | 1250 | 1250 | 1250 | 0 | 13620 |
| Proposed Budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Disposition Costs (optional) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proposed Budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| O&M Govt. FTE Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 212 | 211 | 211 | 310 | 275 | 275 | 275 | 275 | 275 | 275 | 275 | 0 | 2869 |
| Proposed Budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sub-Total O&M Costs (Including Govt. FTE) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1160 | 1062 | 1061 | 1061 | 1470 | 1525 | 1525 | 1525 | 1525 | 1525 | 1525 | 1525 | 0 | 16489 |
| Proposed Budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Cost (Including Govt. FTE costs) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 0 | 0 | 595 | 1265 | 1438 | 1846 | 1844 | 1844 | 1547 | 1650 | 1650 | 1650 | 1650 | 1650 | 1650 | 1650 | 0 | 21929 |
| Proposed Budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Government FTE Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 0 | 0 | 95 | 267 | 278 | 496 | 494 | 494 | 387 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 0 | 4611 |
| PY President's Budget | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Budget (\$) | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Change (\$) | | | | | | | 1844 | 1844 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Change (%) | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |

Full Time Equivalents

Use the following table to provide the number of Government Full Time Equivalents (FTE) represented by the Government FTE Costs in the Summary of Funding Table. Numbers should be entered in decimal format for each of the categories listed.

FTE Table

| | 2012 and Prior | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | PY 2018 | CY 2019 | BY 2020 | BY + 1 2021 | BY + 2 2022 | BY + 3 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 and Beyond | Total |
|-------------------------|----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------|------|------|------|-----------------------|-------|
| Security | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.7 |
| IT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15.3 |
| Financial Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Program Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 1.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8.0 |
| Total* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28.0 |

Funding Sources

BY13 CPIC Lite: BFS - Budget Formulation System (Revision 33)

Funding Sources

* Costs in thousands

| FS Name: MAX Code | Type | Row Type | 201 2 & Prior | 201 3 | 201 4 | 201 5 | 201 6 | 201 7 | PY 201 8 | CY 201 9 | BY 202 0 | BY + 1 202 1 | BY + 2 202 2 | BY + 3 202 3 | 202 4 | 202 5 | 202 6 | 202 7 | 2028 & Beyond | Total | BY Budget Authorit y |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-------------|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------------|-------|-------------------------------|
| Environmental Programs and Management (EPM): 020-00-0108-0 Internal: Yes | | DME | 0 | 0 | 476 | 1012 | 239 | 742 | 741 | 741 | 47 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 0 | 4663 | 47 |
| | | SS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1087 | 947 | 946 | 946 | 1408 | 1163 | 1163 | 1163 | 1163 | 1163 | 1163 | 1163 | 0 | 13475 | 1408 |
| | | Total | 0 | 0 | 476 | 1012 | 1326 | 1689 | 1687 | 1687 | 1455 | 1258 | 1258 | 1258 | 1258 | 1258 | 1258 | 1258 | 0 | 18138 | 1455 |
| Oil Spill Response: 020-00-8221-0 Internal: Yes | | DME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | SS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Superfund (SF): 020-00-0250-0 Internal: Yes | | DME | 0 | 0 | 119 | 253 | 39 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 777 | 30 |
| | | SS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 115 | 115 | 115 | 62 | 362 | 362 | 362 | 362 | 362 | 362 | 362 | 0 | 3014 | 62 |
| | | Total | 0 | 0 | 119 | 253 | 112 | 157 | 157 | 157 | 92 | 392 | 392 | 392 | 392 | 392 | 392 | 392 | 0 | 3791 | 92 |
| Total Yearly Budgets: Internal: No | | DME | 0 | 0 | 595 | 1265 | 278 | 784 | 783 | 783 | 77 | 125 | 125 | 125 | 125 | 125 | 125 | 125 | 0 | 5440 | 77 |
| | | SS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1160 | 1062 | 1061 | 1061 | 1470 | 1525 | 1525 | 1525 | 1525 | 1525 | 1525 | 1525 | 0 | 16489 | 1470 |
| | | Total | 0 | 0 | 595 | 1265 | 1438 | 1846 | 1844 | 1844 | 1547 | 1650 | 1650 | 1650 | 1650 | 1650 | 1650 | 1650 | 0 | 21929 | 1547 |

Security, Privacy and Risk

Security, Privacy and Risk

Does the investment have an up-to-date Security Plan that meets the requirements of OMB policy and NIST guidelines?

If yes, what is the date of the plan?

Has the investment been Certified and Accredited (C&A)?

If yes, provide the certification date:

Does the investment collect Personal Identifiable Information (PII)?

If yes, is the PII classified by EPA as Sensitive PII (e.g. SSN, financial or health records)?

Has the investment conducted a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA)?

Exhibit 53 Questions

Exhibit 53A Questions

Cross-Boundary Information Sharing Identifier None

Data.gov Integration Identifier

Business Reference Model (BRM) Mapping

Service Code Mapping

Is this investment accounted for in the agency Data Center Consolidation Plan?

Provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to www.whitehouse.gov/omb/e-gov

Supports Information Sharing, Access, and Safeguarding None
(select all that apply; Applies to BY16 and prior)

What is the amount of this investment's PY funding associated with the agency's HSPD-12 implementation?
(* Costs in thousands)

If this investment supports homeland security, Indicate None
by corresponding number which homeland security mission area(s) this investment supports?

OMB Short Description

Budget Formulation System (BFS) formerly titled New Budget Formulation System (NBFS) will be EPA's future budgeting system . Budget Automation System (formerly titled Budget Formulation System) is EPA's current budgeting system. Development began in 2014.

Exhibit 53B Security Costs Table

Enter data for only Rows 4, 5, 7 & 8.

IT Security Spending (Exhibit 53B)

| Security Category | PY | CY | BY |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|
| Number of Government FTEs with information security responsibilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Average cost per Government FTE | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of Contractor FTEs with information security responsibilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Average cost per Contractor FTE | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total IT Security Tools Costs: | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Costs for NIST 800-37 implementation | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of systems scheduled for activities represented in Row 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Annual FISMA testing costs | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Network penetration testing activities costs | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Security awareness training costs | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Security training costs for employees with significant security responsibilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Milestones

Cost and Schedule Performance Table

Master Cost & Schedule: Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline

* Costs in thousands

This table represents milestones at Work Breakdown Structure level 1

| Activity Number | Is Complete | Project ** | Activity Name* | Activity Description ** | Structure ID** | OMB ID* | Current Baseline | | | | | | | | | Include In ITDB | | |
|-----------------|-------------|------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------|---------|------------------|-----------|--------|------------|-----------|--------|-----------------|-----------|--------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | Total Cost | | | Start Date | | | Completion Date | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | Planned ** | Projected | Actual | Planned ** | Projected | Actual | Planned ** | Projected | Actual | | | |

Optional Questions

General

What percentage of the total IT budget was allocated to security in BY 2012?

What percentage of the total IT budget will be allocated to security in BY 2013?

List the investment's performance indicators.

Was an operational analysis or customer survey conducted?

If yes, describe the results of the operational analysis or survey.

What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per FAC-P/PM)?

Enterprise Architecture

How does the investment support achieving EPA's (or your office's) Target Architecture?

Please list any PART programs the investment supports or plans to support:

Please list any eGov, FTF, or LoB initiatives the investment currently or plans to support or utilize:

Select the Agency enterprise tools/services this investment utilizes. (Select all that apply)

Alternatives Analysis

Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this investment? Yes

If "yes," what is the date of the analysis?

If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

If yes, describe the results of the alternatives analysis.

Two rounds of alternative analysis were performed. One under the auspices of OMB's Budget Line of Business activity, which looks at systems across the federal government. The other was a more tailored EPA-specific analysis.

Other existing government and private sector systems were looked at as options by the EPA, but no other systems met EPA's requirements other than the current BAS or the new Budget Formulation System.

Development of Budget Formulation System is a preferred option. Alternatives described, below.

List and describe three alternatives identified for this investment (may include Status Quo).

1. Status Quo - Will require using Citrix to maintain usability when the EPA transitions to Windows 7. However, there are other issues associated with the software, and replacement is preferred over using existing oracle versions that have ongoing software problems. In addition, there are functionality enhancements the EPA needs that will provide significant efficiencies in staff time, and also enable offices to eliminate local systems. In addition, the current system is written to interact with Lotus Notes database which is currently being migrated to the Microsoft suite of tools. The status quo is becoming less of a viable option due to supporting applications and inherent outdated technologies.
2. Rewrite and update - As described above, enhancements in functionality have been identified by the EPA that will save significant staff time, and provide an enterprise solution that replaces a number of locally maintained smaller systems.
Other agencies have indicated interest in using a system with the functions in EPA's BAS / BFS if configured to their budget structures. The Budget Formulation System is being offered as a Shared Service to other agencies while utilizing the cloud hosting model, creating savings for the federal government overall and meeting the recent guidance from OMB. To meet that goal, BFS has been established as a new Working Capital Fund service to other agencies.
3. Modify existing government systems - The review looked at systems in place across a number of other agencies. These systems were generally rudimentary and would prove more expensive to modify them than to proceed with the Budget Formulation System development.

What is the impact of NOT funding this investment?

The budgetary information of the agency cannot be formulated without the BFS investment. Thus, the agency and external stakeholders cannot make the appropriate budget decisions without this investment.

Not replacing the legacy system will mean the agency continues to use outdated technology with increasing costs of maintenance, and forgoes the advantages and efficiencies expected from new functionality that is planned. In addition, the agency and the wider federal government would lose the potential benefit of providing a federal shared service in this area.

As noted before, this CPIC provides a transition from the agency's old legacy status to an improved system. The current BAS system has been in production since 1997 and will be retired for the BFS system in 2017.

Security and Risk

Does the investment have a Risk Plan?

If yes, provide the date of the Risk Plan:

If no, describe the strategy for managing and addressing risk:

If the Security categorization (ASSERT/SysCat) is a Moderate level or higher, does the investment have a current Security Risk Assessment?

If yes, provide the date of the Security Risk Assessment:

If no, explain:

How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified and validated by the Agency?